



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/801,736	03/16/2004	Viktors Berstis	AUS919990100US2	1851
35525 7590 03/14/2007 IBM CORP (YA) C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS, TX 75380			EXAMINER CAMPBELL, JOSHUA D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/14/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/801,736	Applicant(s) BERSTIS, VIKTORS	
	Examiner Joshua D. Campbell	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 December 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15, 16, 18-25, 40, 41, 43-50, 55, 56 and 58-65 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15, 16, 18-25, 40, 41, 43-50, 55, 56 and 58-65 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 12/18/2006
2. Claims 15, 16, 18-25, 40, 41, 43-50, 55, 56, and 58-65 are pending in this case. Claims 15, 40, and 55 are independent claims. Claims 1-14, 17, 26-39, 42, 51-54, and 57 were cancelled. Claims 15, 16, 18, 20, 23-25, 40, 41, 43-45, 48-50, 55, 56, 58, 60, and 63-65 have been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Claims 15, 16, 18-25, 40, 41, 43-50, 55, 56, and 58-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nielsen (US Patent Number 5,875,443, issued on February 23, 1999).

Regarding independent claim 15, Nielsen discloses that an organizational database includes dictionaries as organizational units, the dictionaries being hierarchically ordered (column 6, lines 19-47 of Nielsen). Nielsen discloses scanning a data stream and detecting a word that does not match any of the words in a dictionary (column 3, lines 15-50 of Nielsen). Nielsen also discloses that a user may indicate that, regardless of not detecting the word, it is correctly spelled and add it to a dictionary (column 3, lines 30-51 of Nielsen). Nielsen also discloses that a list of dictionaries to be updated with the new term is provided (column 6, line 64-column 7, line 12 of Nielsen).

Nielsen discloses that a database contains multiple dictionaries that are broken down into organizational units (column 3, line 30-column 4, line 11 of Nielsen). The determination of which dictionaries to update on the server is determined based on these organizational units (column 3, line 30-column 4, line 11 of Nielsen).

Regarding dependent claim 16, Nielsen discloses that the user is presented with the option of adding it to any of the user's dictionaries (column 3, lines 30-51 of Nielsen). Once the user selects the dictionary to add the term to that dictionary is updated with the new term (column 3, lines 30-51 of Nielsen).

Regarding dependent claims 18 and 19, Nielsen discloses that determining which organizational unit the user belongs to is used to select which dictionaries to update (column 3, line 30-column 4, line 11 of Nielsen). Nielsen also discloses that determination is made as to whether or not local dictionaries on client computers and the master copy of the dictionary on the server need to be updated upon an indication of a new term by the user (column 3, line 30-column 4, line 11 of Nielsen).

Regarding dependent claims 20-22, Nielsen discloses updating the dictionaries that were determined to require updates of the new term and updating the master copy of the dictionary (column 3, line 51-column 4, line 47 of Nielsen). Nielsen also discloses that message is sent from the client to the server comprising the new term and an update message is sent from the server to clients comprising the new term (column 3, line 51-column 4, line 47 of Nielsen).

Regarding dependent claim 23, Nielsen discloses that the determination of which dictionaries to update on the server is determined based on these organizational units by the server (column 3, lines 30-65 of Nielsen).

Regarding dependent claim 24, Nielsen discloses that the determination of which dictionaries to update on the server is determined based on these organizational units by the client computer (column 3, lines 30-65 of Nielsen).

Regarding dependent claim 25, Nielsen discloses that the dictionary that is updated can just be the default dictionary (column 3, line 30-column 4, line 11 of Nielsen).

Regarding independent claim 40 and dependent claims 41 and 43-50, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claims 15, 16, and 18-25. Thus, the claims are rejected along the same rationale as claims 15, 16, and 18-25.

Regarding independent claim 55 and dependent claims 56 and 58-65, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claims 15, 16, and 18-25. Thus, the claims are rejected along the same rationale as claims 15, 16, and 18-25.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 12/18/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the applicant's arguments on pages 9-13, in reference to the limitations added to the independent claims regarding an organizational database containing a hierarchically ordered set of dictionaries, each dictionary as a different unit

Art Unit: 2178

in the database, the examiner believes that Nielsen clearly discloses a database with hierarchically ordered dictionaries as the units in the database as can be seen in the rejection above. For instance, Nielsen discloses that a database would include the main dictionary supplied by the vendor and additionally it would include any supplemental dictionaries that are customized by the user (column 6, lines 19-47 of Nielsen). This database containing a main dictionaries and then one or more sub-dictionaries corresponds to the definition of a hierarchically ordered set of dictionaries, with the main dictionary corresponding to the highest level of dictionary, the parent of the other dictionaries so to speak. Thus, as clearly shown the claims remain rejected.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2178

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua D. Campbell whose telephone number is (571) 272-4133. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30 AM - 4:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JDC
March 7, 2007


STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER